

SECTION 01 **A**

THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

Several different Common Core State Standard (CCSS) descriptions are highlighted.
Note the evolution in phrasing of the term “internationally benchmarked”.

page 01: The current CCSS website description
-www.corestandards.org-

page 02 (bottom half): United States Department of Education PRESS RELEASE
Race To The Top competition
-www.ed.gov-

page 03: Past Common Core website description. (webpage dated March 15, 2010)
-www.archive.org-

page 04: Past Common Core website description. (webpage dated March 23, 2010)
-www.archive.org-

The Press Release clearly spells out, and sets up an expectation, that the CCSS will be “internationally benchmarked”.

page 05: Achieve’s “international benchmarking” history.
-www.achieve.org-

pages 07 - 31: Part of “Benchmarking for Success”
a report by Achieve Inc., The National Governors Association (NGA), Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
-www.corestandards.org/assets/0812BENCHMARKING.pdf-

YOU CANNOT CERTIFY YOUR OWN PRODUCT.

The two recent “independent studies” cited by PARCC Inc. Communications Director David Conerty-Martin, one released by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute (supposed to be released last September pre-DESE vote) and the other by The Human Resources Research Organization, were funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. They also generously supported “Benchmarking for Success”.

pages 32 - 37: Published Common Core State Standards reference material.
-www.corestandards.org-

page 38: Current Mississippi Department of Education State website description.
-www.mde.k12.ms.us-

Apparently Mississippi did not get the memo. They seem to be sticking with “internationally benchmarked”. At least they were through this past January.

pages 39 - 40: Most recent Massachusetts/PARCC Memorandum of Understanding
December 2015
-received from Massachusetts DESE

We now share “internationally rigorous benchmarks” with other states.

:

New science standards, ones just as wordy and testably specific as the CCSS, were just adopted by DESE.

These standards possess “clarification statements”. Much like the ones Maryland has since added to their version of the CCSS.
The Massachusetts pre-2010 standards were legible and working.

REPEAL THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS NOW!

AND

PLEASE INTRODUCE AN AMENDMENT TO REPEAL THE BOARD OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION'S RECENT ADOPTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY/ ENGINEERING STANDARDS. A PROPER SET OF EDUCATION STANDARDS SHOULD NOT NEED MORE EXPLANATION TO BE UNDERSTOOD.

THEY ARE HARD TO READ.

SECTION 02 **A**

THE 7.7 MILLION DOLLAR PEARSON SETTLEMENT

page 01: New York Times article
-www.nytimes.com-

Winnie Hu, December 21, 2011
“Testing Firm Faces Inquiry On Free Trips for Officials”

New York Attorney General investigates Pearson Education.

Why does Massachusetts still honor its contract with Pearson Education?

The terms and conditions that bound us to the Race To The Top (RTTT) agreement have been broken.

The CCSS do not meet the initial promise made by the United States Department of Education. They said that any common standard the country adopted had to be “internationally benchmarked”.

The PARCC assessments, that will soon be taken by 2/3 of the students in this state, are based on a horribly convoluted jumble of jargon.

Read the PARCC sample test questions.

The PARCC assessment will once again be handed to Massachusetts students and graded by Pearson Education in less than one month.

left
page 02 (upper half): Pearson's official post inquiry statement
-www.pearsonfoundation.org-

There were duplicate statements published by Pearson Education and the Pearson Foundation. After the settlement was announced publicly, two webpages were posted on the internet. Since then, the pages have entered the all-consuming internet black hole known now as 404 error:page not found.

right

page 02 (upper half): New York Times article

-www.nytimes.com

Javier C. Hernandez, December 12, 2013
"Educational Publisher's Charity, Accused of Seeking Profits, Will Pay Millions"

pages 03 - 04: New York State Attorney General's office official website.

www.ag.ny.gov/press-release/ag-schneiderman-secures-77-million-settlement-pearson-charitable-foundation-support

SECTION 03 **A**

RECOMMITMENT CLAUSE

pages 01 - 02: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Board of Education meeting minutes July 21, 2010
-www.doe.mass.edu-

Governor Baker has repeatedly reminded the public that he spoke against adoption of the CCSS in 2010.

The PARCC assessment has been totally aligned to the CCSS. Every question in the PARCC consortium's question bank has been designed to test the CCSS.

Governor Charlie Baker had the opportunity to stop this State's participation in the CCSS aligned assessment system (PARCC) but he did not.

Governor Baker made his position clear when he refused to act on the MOU requirement to sign a recommitment letter within five months of taking office.

pages 03 - 04: State House News Service report
-www.salemlnews.com

STATE HOUSE NEWS SERVICE
Matt Murphy, August 26, 2015
"Common Core Foes Distribute NOBMG Video of Baker Comments"

pages 05 - 06: Massachusetts' PARCC/RTTT application
-www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-applications/massachusetts.pdf

pages 07 - 08: Massachusetts' PARCC MOU appendix (valid through November 2015)
-received from Massachusetts DESE

page 09: Public Records Request response
-received from Massachusetts DESE

pages 10 - 12: PARCC Inc invoices for the timeframe June 9 - November 2015
-received from Massachusetts DESE

Amount paid to PARCC Inc. after the recommitment letter was not signed.

SECTION 03 ADDENDUM:

In the DESE's response to my request for Governor Baker's recommitment letter, it is stated that the PARCC MOU was an agreement between states and not with the United States Department of Education.

The federal government controls every aspect of the Common Core through grant making and competition. If a state does not meet the terms of the competition, the state does not win the grant money.

There is federal control over the educational system in this country. We are currently allowing the Massachusetts Executive Office of Education to carry out the exact same method of control over our towns by using grant money to influence policy decisions.

RE: FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

pages 13 - 42: Federal PARCC MOU amendment responses/decisions
-www.ed.gov

all amendments to the PARCC consortium MOU had to be approved by the United States Federal Department of Education.

When did we allow the United States Department of Education to become a punitive arm of the Executive Branch?

Why are we letting the United States Senate and House dictate educational constraints over Massachusetts' right to control its own educational path, what programs we need to adopt and when.

Those are choices we all need to reserve as residents of Massachusetts.

an excerpt from "Redesigning School Districts: The Way Forward"
-by Massachusetts Secretary of Education Jim Peyser April 28, 2014

"in several cities around the country, we are beginning to see a path forward. Specifically, district superintendents, state education commissioners, and mayors..."

The above statement does not mention parents, students or teachers. This is not an isolated incident.

pages 43 - 53: Competing Principles by Joanne Weiss, Director of Race to the Top
-www.ssir.org/articles/entry/competing_principles-

Former Director of Race To the Top openly discusses Arne Duncan's program.

I have taken the liberty of removing all the words that do not need to be there.

pages 54 - 55: Letter placing Massachusetts on "high risk status". (from USED)
-received from Massachusetts DESE

Do what the MOU says you would do or else.

page 56: United States Department of Education (USED) proposed Rule
-www.reginfo.gov-

Arne Duncan removed our states authority to "define modified academic achievement standards and develop alternate assessments based on those modified standards".

pages 57-70: Text of some legal citations cited in Secretary Duncan's proposed Rule

THE UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF EDUCATION GETS AWAY WITH IT.

ANOTHER LIAR REWARDED.

SECTION 04 **A**

NOT BEING HONEST

page 01: USED RTTT press release November 12, 2009
-www.yahoo.com-

Money released to develop common assessments among states.

page 02: Letter to Achieve Inc. submitted with Massachusetts' PARCC application
-accompanied Massachusetts' PARCC MOU submission to Achieve Inc.

Massachusetts Commissioner of Education commits to participating in the
PARCC Consortium only if it is in the Commonwealth's best interest.

page 03: Massachusetts DESE Board meeting minutes Sept. 21, 2010
-www.doe.mass.edu-

Massachusetts Commissioner of Education states that 275 districts have
committed to the reforms outlined in the RTTT application.

page 04: PARCC Application dated June 23, 2010
-www.parcconline.com-

275 districts in Massachusetts committed to administer the PARCC assessment in
the year 2014-2015.

Those were the terms of the competition.

page 05 - 08: Massachusetts DESE Board meeting minutes January 23, 2012
-www.doe.mass.edu-

Massachusetts Commissioner of Education states that there has been no
previous commitment to "sunset MCAS".

page 09 - 51: Massachusetts RTTT State scope of work February 9, 2012
-www.doe.mass.edu-

Two weeks later, Massachusetts' Commissioner of Education submits this document to the United States Department of Education.

-page 18

"In four years we will be prepared to administer this assessment in place of our current state assessments in those subjects."

page 52: Key Board Decisions "two year test drive" fact sheet
--www.doe.mass.edu-

page 53: Massachusetts DESE Board meeting minutes November 19, 2013
-www.doe.mass.edu-

So is this a "test drive" or a "transition"? Those are two very different words.

page 54: PARCC piktochart: choosing an assessment
-www.doe.mass.edu-

On November 17, 2015, the DESE Board of Education voted to base MCAS 2.0 on PARCC but did not adopt the PARCC test in name.

This piktochart states that the "Board listens to feedback from educators, parents and students.

Out of the eleven voting members of the board, three voted against a PARCC hybrid test. The three Massachusetts Board Members that voted against this hybrid test were the student, teacher and parent representatives.

GREAT LISTENING SO FAR.

page 55: Final two year test-drive fact sheet circa 2015
-www.doe.mass.edu-

page 56: Commissioner Chester's Next-Generation assessment recommendation
-www.doe.mass.edu-

pages 57 - 62: Massachusetts DESE Board meeting minutes November 17, 2015
-www.doe.mass.edu-

PARCC questions will be placed on every students ELA and math MCAS exam this year. You would need to read the Commissioner's recommendation to find out about that. That fact is not on the parent handout (page 55).

SECTION 05 **A**

NOT A CURRICULUM

page 01: Montage of United States Government Laws/Regulations

Oak Norton, July 11, 2012
-www.utahnsagainstcommoncore.com-

The Federal Government is breaking the rules that govern its existence.

page 02 (upper half): Common Core Standards website
-www.corestandards.org-

pages 02 (lower half) - 03: Articles about Ms. Slover and PARCC Inc.
-www.google.com-

Testing as part of instruction?

pages 04 - 05: DESE webpage
-www.doe.mass.edu-

RTTT funds paid for a bank of CCSS aligned curriculum units for teachers to use.

pages 06 - 07: DESE webpage
-www.doe.mass.edu-

“working toward standards aligned curriculum”. The CCSS standards.

page 08: Competing Principles by Joanne Weiss, Director of Race to the Top
-www.ssir.org/articles/entry/competing_principles

Joanne Weiss, Fall 2015
“Competing Principles”

Model curriculum units used in over 20 percent of classrooms nationwide.

pages 09 - 15: Pearson, PowerSchool, Schoology, Connexxus and Partners -www.google.com-
THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS ARE THE ROOT OF EVERY
MASSACHUSETTS MODEL CURRICULUM UNIT. PAID FOR BY THE GOVT.

SECTION 06 **A**

CHAIRMAN FOR FIVE YEARS

pages 382 - 408: Complete PARCC Consortium Memorandum Of Understanding
Summer 2010 - December 14, 2015
-received from Massachusetts DESE

page 392, section 4, part a:

As states were dropping out of the Consortium, our Commissioner (who was the Chairman of the PARCC Governing Board for the entire length of the initial PARCC MOU) refused to abandon the PARCC Consortium.

9 out of the original 26 PARCC Consortium applicant states remain active members of the PARCC Consortium.

2 of those states are pursuing other options involving PARCC questions.

Massachusetts is currently one of the two states pursuing other options.

Massachusetts should no longer remain one of those states.

Dump PARCC. The smart states already have.

page 409: Article about MCAS 2.0/PARCC hybrid
-www.google.com

MCAS 2.0 could be up to 90 percent PARCC.

The Board of Education never voted to adopt the PARCC assessment yet it will be the basis for all our future testing.

This coming from a guy who chaired the PARCC Governing Board for five years.

The extended period of management constitutes a clear conflict of interest.

page 410: MCAS 2.0 update
-www.doe.mass.edu-

I look forward to seeing the PARCC Consortium's re-organization plans.

pages 411 - 419: PARCC Consortium MOU December 2015 - June 2016
-received from Massachusetts DESE

The current PARCC Consortium MOU was re-worded so that Massachusetts may still participate as a Governing State.

page 413, part 4, section A.1, A.1.a, (A.1.a.ii)

Why would we commit to "support efforts to maintain, improve and innovate the (PARCC) assessment system" if we did not adopt the test?

NONE OF THIS MAKES SENSE.

MASSACHUSETTS LED THE PACK BECAUSE WE VALUED GREAT TEACHING. MOST OF THOSE TEACHERS ARE STILL GOING TO WORK EVERY DAY IN THIS STATE'S PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

WE HAVE ALLOWED THE MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO DEMONIZE THIS PROFESSION AND TRANSFORM THE ART OF TEACHING INTO A FAST FOOD CORPORATION.

TO REACH THE TOP WE DID NOT NEED COMPUTERS OR DATA.

WE TRUSTED OUR PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS.

WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO RELY ON OUR ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS TO SAFEGUARD OUR CHILDREN.

PARENTS CAN CRIPPLE THIS SYSTEM BY SIMPLY REFUSING TO ALLOW THEIR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PARCC ASSESSMENT.

STATE FUNDING DROPS WHEN PARTICIPATION DIPS BELOW 90-95%.

SECTION 01 **B**

THE PARCC CONSORTIUM BYLAWS

pages 01 - 14: The only version of the PARCC Consortium Bylaws I have seen.
-www.parcconline.org-

These Bylaws were adopted April 12, 2012*

Article 15, (my page 14) Restrictions on Activities, states that "no substantial part of the activities of PARCC shall be the carrying on of propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation".

page 15: Letter from Commissioner Chester to the Massachusetts State Ethics Commission.

-Massachusetts Department of Education Document-

This letter states that there were changes made to the PARCC Bylaws between the time of June 2013 and July 15, 2014. Maybe these Bylaws are different than the PARCC Consortium Bylaws.

Contacting both PARCC Inc and the Massachusetts DESE has not yet resulted in any amended Bylaws being made available to me.

I certainly gave it a good faith effort.

If requested, I will provide a detailed timeline of my correspondence with both PARCC Inc. and DESE.

**There should be at least one, maybe two, revisions to this document. I have not been able to obtain a more current copy of the PARCC Bylaws.*

SECTION 02 **B**

PROPOGANDA

page 01: The PARCC Consortium explains their “independent” studies.

-www.parcconline.org-

Most of these reports are nowhere close to independent or objective.

I have included the cover page to most of these reports, as well as the page referring to who funded the study.

~~The USB thumb drive will provide you with .pdf copies of the entire documents I have included the cover sheets for (pages 04 thru 15).~~

pages 02 - 03: PARCC Consortium press release about two “independent” studies.

-www.parcconline.org-

The Fordham and HumRRO studies were supposed to be released prior to the DESE Board's PARCC vote November 2015. (See page 28 of the “Educating Students For Success” report). These two studies were not published until February of 2016.

pages 04 - 05: The Opportunity To Lead

-www.parcconline.org-

The first of two MBAE publications included in the propoganda section.

This report was written by Pearson Education's “Chief Education Strategist”.

pages 06 - 07: Educating Students For Success

-www.parcconline.org-

This would be the second MBAE publication of note. It compares a real MCAS assessment to the promise of PARCC. Hardly scientific or objective.

page 08: National Benchmarks For State Achievement Standards

-www.air.org/resource/national-benchmarks-state-achievement-standards

This publication was produced by the only other company bidding for the current MCAS 2.0 contract.

See the next page for a small sampling of the money The Gates Foundation has donated to this organization.

page 09: Portion of the Gates Foundation Grant Award Listing
-www.gatesfoundation.org-

Feel free to search the Gates Foundation website for more donations to AIR.

page 10: Better Tests, Fewer Barriers
-www.americanprogress.org-

Another Next-Generation Assessment Study.

page 11: Center For American Progress Donor List
-www.americanprogress.org-

Over a million dollars from The Gates Foundation.

pages 12 - 13: Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments
-www.americanprogress.org-

Vocal proponent of the Common Core from the start. Again funded by Gates.

pages 14 - 15: Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments
-www.humrro.org-

One final study funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Massachusetts taxpayers were promised a robust comparison of PARCC to MCAS on November 19th, 2013. We never got anything close.

Pages 17-30 are two versions of the same story. The backstory is very important. Much of the reform effort has been funded by the Gates Foundation. Pure propaganda.

pages 17 - 22: The Washington Post
-www.washingtonpost.com-

Lyndsey Layton
"How Bill Gates Pulled Off The Swift Common Core Revolution"
June 7, 2014

pages 23 -29: DESE version of the Washington Post article,
-Massachusetts Department of Education Document-

SECTION 03 **B**

OR OTHERWISE ATTEMPTING TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

page 01 - 02: The Lowell Sun
-www.lowellsun.com-

Amelia Pak-Harvey
"Lowell School Board Alters Course, Backs PARCC"
January 20, 2016

The article spells it out pretty clearly.

The Lowell School Committee switched their original vote for MCAS to PARCC
after Commissioner Chester's visit.

CHAPTER 04 pages 23-26 SHIS

Early childhood educators did not create the Common Core Standards. They were created by professors, politicians and businessmen.

Common Core is unconstitutional according to the 10th Amendment which states:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

The constitution makes no mention of education therefore it is a State responsibility.

In my opinion, Common Core violates the intention of United States code of Federal regulations 1232a which states:

“No provision of any applicable program shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system.

The language game being played by the Federal Government and The Massachusetts Department of Education is criminal.

Page one of my handout is culled from two sources. The Federal Department of Education's website clearly states “The Department does not develop or implement testing to measure whether states are meeting their education standards.” PARCC was established in 2010 with a \$186 million federal grant that funds the development of the assessments. I guess if you fund it...technically, you're not developing it. I guess if you invite states to take part in a competition where they have to embrace a common set of standards and implement a variety of other suggestions/ recommendations... you are not technically implementing them.

Is that really the game we want to play with educating our children?

CHAPTER 04 pages 23-26 SHIS

The PARCC Consortium, originally consisting of 26 states is down to 15 on its published website. Of those 15, more are now publicly stating they will drop out and I believe at least four have chosen not to participate in the 2014-2015 year tests. I have heard the current count at only nine states still participating.

A New Mexico court has placed Pearson's contract with PARCC on hold while it looks into allegations of unfair contracting processes. I will not even get into Pearson today.

Massachusetts is consistently one of, if not number one, the top performing states in the country year after year. Why are we lowering our standards?

The Federal Race to the Top program specified states were to adopt "internationally benchmarked" standards in order to qualify for a cash reward from U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. The Press release was titled "President Obama, U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan announce national competition to advance school reform". I have enclosed a portion of that release in your packets.

How can we now be aligning PARCC tests to a "Common Core" set of Standard that have not been "internationally benchmarked? The official Common Core website states simply that the Common Core Standards were informed internationally. I will say that again...informed, not benchmarked. I have enclosed a copy of that document as well.

Jason Zimba, a lead writer of the Standards stated about the standards:

"I think it's a fair critique that it's a minimal definition of college readiness... but not for the colleges most parents aspire to... Not only not for STEM, it's also not for selective colleges.

I ask again...why are we lowering our standards?

The PARCC test promises valuable feedback to inform teachers, principals and administrators of any and all areas that need improvement. I say to you...teachers already do that.

CHAPTER 04 pages 23-26 SHIS

What teachers and students need are able bodies in their classroom. PARCC does not provide these bodies. PARCC sucks funds from already cash strapped towns and cities across the consortium. That is why PARCC is failing. It does nothing to help solve a schools problems. If the PARCC results come back stating 6 readers are dangerously low...who is going to be there to pick them up? We need Math Specialists and Reading Specialists to support the teachers in the classrooms.

Our schools run out of paper at the end of the year. Our schools have children whose parents are in jail. Our schools have students with no educational support once they leave the class at the end of a school day. Our schools have parents who swear at Crossing guards. Our schools have medicated students coming to school without having taken their medication. How can you tie teacher performance evaluations to these test scores?

By allowing PARCC to be implemented in Salem you are saying that these things don't matter, our priority is data.

Data does not put food in a hungry child's mouth or a safe roof over a homeless child's head. PARCC assessments are not the answer, they just add another layer of talking heads over the others.

What School Committees across this state need to do is stop taking orders from our current "leadership", and I use the term very loosely, in the Department of Education. Instead of blaming teachers start helping them.

Thomas Weber, Mitchell Chester, and Richard M. Freeland, our three Massachusetts commissioners recently endorsed "A seamless education system that begins at birth and links across all sectors is necessary to ensuring that our children achieve at high levels and succeed throughout their education and careers". I have included the press release in your packets. If you flip that sheet over you will see an accompanying press release from the Federal DOE that came out half a year prior. It explains how this system will work in tandem with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. ~~There is one other sheet in there as well about the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge. Line them all up next to each~~
incorrect information given. numbers did add up.

CHAPTER 04 pages 23-26 SHIS

~~other and find the information that doesn't sync up. It's like one of those games on a kids menu only...it's not a game.~~

incorrect information given. numbers did add up.

Please tell me how many data repositories will hold my child's birth through whenever information. I would like you to tell me who has access to my child's information. Can you tell me what "supplementary metadata and information from state education agencies" is? What role does Pearson play in Data storage? I found an app online today and I was going to talk about it...but I also received this about an hour ago and I am willing to bet none of you have seen it.

And I am willing to bet that is because none of our three Massachusetts Department of Education officials never wanted you to see it. I hold in my hands who our data is actually being sent to. Please tell me why the Massachusetts Association of School Committees had to submit a freedom of information request to find out who student information is being licensed to?